

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-53, 55-90, and 92-110 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 12, 24, 37, 48, 61, 74, 85 and 98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dankberg et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,596,439) and He (U.S. Pat. No. 6,870,881) and further in view of Rabenko et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,765,931). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, Dankberg, either singly or in combination with He and Rabenko, fails to show, teach, or suggest that the composite signal, the replica transmission signal, and the analog baseline correction current are **connected together at a common node** of the first sub-circuit.

It is a longstanding rule that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1974), see MPEP §2143.03. Furthermore, when evaluating claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, all of the limitations must be considered and given weight. *Ex parte Grasselli*, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983), MPEP § 2144.03. Here, the alleged combination fails to disclose the limitation that the composite signal, the replica transmission signal, and the analog baseline correction current are **connected together at a common node**.

As shown in an exemplary embodiment in FIG. 11 of the present application, an active resistive summer (i.e. a first sub-circuit) includes an operational amplifier with a negative input terminal. The negative input terminal receives, as inputs, a composite signal  $V_{txRL}$ , a replica signal  $V_{txR}$ , and an analog baseline correction current  $I_{bl}$ . Each of the composite signal  $V_{txRL}$ , the replica signal  $V_{txR}$ , and the analog baseline correction current  $I_{bl}$  are connected together at the negative input terminal. In other words, the signals are **connected together at a common node of the first sub-circuit**.

The Examiner acknowledges that Dankberg fails to disclose that the composite signal, the replica transmission signal, and the baseline correction current are connected together at a common node and instead relies on He to disclose this limitation. In particular, the Examiner alleges that FIG. 9 of He discloses an adder 22 that "receives signals from echo canceller 10 and baseline correction circuit 12." Applicants respectfully note that **He still fails to disclose that the three signals are connected together at a common node**.

For example, a different adder 14 receives an output from the baseline correction circuit 12. This output is combined with another signal and input to ADC 16. The ADC 16 outputs a digital signal to delay adjustment block 20. An output of the delay adjustment block 20 is received at the adder 22. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that **the output of the baseline correction circuit is not connected together at a common node with the composite signal and the replica transmission signal**.

Applicants respectfully note that Dankberg fails to disclose that the three signals are connected together at a common node. As described above, He fails to make up for the deficiencies of Dankberg and is absent of any teaching or suggestion of

connecting the signals together at a common node. As such, combining Dankberg with He and/or Rabenko still fails to disclose the elements of claim 1.


Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, should be allowable for at least the above reasons. Claims 12, 24, 37, 48, 61, 74, 85, and 98, as well as their corresponding dependent claims, should be allowable for at least similar reasons.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 5, 2007

By:   
Michael D. Wiggins  
Reg. No. 34,754

Damian M. Aquino  
Reg. No. 54,964

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDW/DMA/dms